

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/531,921	07/07/2005	Alexander Kammerlocher	P05,0116	6015	
26574 SCHIFF HAR	7590 08/31/2010 DIN LLP	EXAMINER			
PATENT DEF	PARTMENT	HON, MING Y			
CHICAGO, II	Drive-Suite 6600 , 60606-6473		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2625		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/31/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)						
10/531,921	KAMMERLOCHER ET AL.						
Examiner	Art Unit						
MING HON	2625						

	MING HON	2625	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the se set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 27 CER 44 27 must be	filed within two months	a of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Nation of Nan Co	maliant Amandment /	DTOL 224)
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		Inpliant Amendment (	F TOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Mark K Zimmerman/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625	/M. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 2625		

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per Claim 93, the applicant alleges the Murakami failed to disclose "a first printer control unit comprising a control panel server which the at least one operating unit accesses as a client to output control data" Murakami as seen in Figure 3 and Paragraph (0299) and the Abstract discloses a server containing a print job processing unit. The server is connected to the printer via a network interface adaptor and the server is sending the printer a print job. There is an operation input unit, 21 in the server to provide control to the server.

The applicant alleges that Murakami failed to disclose "first printer comprises an internal network". It's inherent that a printer contains an internal network. There are memory modules and print controllers inside the printer that need to communicate with other in order to print. The server being connected to the internal network doesn't require the server to be inside the printer as the remarks filed seems to imply. The server of Murakami contains print jobs which will be transferred to the printer to be printed. Therefore the server must be connected to the network interface of the internal network to send information ultimately to the print controller.

The applicant alleges that Murakami failed to disclose plurality of sub-controllers are taught because there must be a control such as network interface to communicate with the server and a control to print the print job being sent from the server.

The applicant alleges that at least one operating unit is outputting the control data in addition to the operating information where that control data is useful to set system parameters of the second printer. The examiner disagrees. The operating information of Lester is considered the print job and its parameters. The control data is used to determine if the print job should be rerouted to the second printer. Therefore the control data is useful to set the system parameters of the second printer because the control data will determine if it's necessary to set the system parameters or not. The "control data" being useful does not require the control data being useful.